

**REMARKS**

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated August 27, 2004, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on November 27, 2004. Claims 2, 3, 15, 19, 24, and 25 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 4-14, 16-18, 20-23, and 26-27 remain pending after this amendment. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 3-4, 15 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1, 14, and 18 have been amended such that they are now equivalent in scope to claims 3, 15, and 19 rewritten in independent form, as suggested. Claim 4 has been amended to depend from claim 1 rather than claim 3. Accordingly, Applicants submit these claims are now in condition for allowance.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

Claims 1-2, 5-13 and 22-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Saeki* (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0079938).

As described above, claim 1 has been rewritten to include all the limitations of claim 3, which the Examiner has indicated as allowable. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1, as well as those claims that depend therefrom, are allowable and respectfully request removal of this rejection with respect to these claims.

Claim 8 has been amended to recite a current path from an output node of a current source includes a branch for the flow of current from the output node only when the late phase signal is asserted and the current source is disabled regardless of the state of the switches. Applicants submit that this limitation is not taught in *Saeki*. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 8, as well as those claims that depend

therefrom, are allowable and respectfully request removal of this rejection with respect to these claims.

Claim 22 has been amended to recite closing one or more switches to selectively couple one or more of a plurality of delay transistors having different dimensions to the common output node of the current source. Applicants submit that this limitation is not taught in *Saeki*. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 22, as well as those claims that depend therefrom, are allowable and respectfully request removal of this rejection with respect to these claims.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 14 and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art (Fig. 1) in view of *Saeki*.

As described above, claim 14 has been rewritten to include all the limitations of claim 15, which the Examiner has indicated as allowable. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 14, as well as those claims that depend therefrom, are allowable and respectfully request removal of this rejection with respect to these claims.


Claims 18 and 20-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kwak* (U.S. Patent No. 6,646,939) in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (Fig. 1) and *Saeki*.

As described above, claim 18 has been rewritten to include all the limitations of claim 19, which the Examiner has indicated as allowable. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 18, as well as those claims that depend therefrom, are allowable and respectfully request removal of this rejection with respect to these claims.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Gero G. McClellan  
Registration No. 44,227  
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicants